



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,063	09/11/2003	Margaret A. R. Beynon	GB920020082US1	6190
7590 IBM Corporation IP Law Department 11400 Burnet Road Austin, TX 78758		EXAMINER NUNEZ, JORDANY		
		ART UNIT 2175		
		MAIL DATE 08/19/2008		
		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/660,063

**Applicant(s)**

BEYNON ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jordany Núñez

**Art Unit**

2175

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/11/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 17-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 17-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1448 or PTO-6090)  
Paper No(s) Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s) Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 15, 17-23, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. (US7099867, hereinafter Okada) in view of Mandato et al (US20010025280, hereinafter Mandato), in view of Hayes-Roth (US20020054072).

As to claim 15:

Okada shows method for adding context to a chat transcript, comprising the steps of:

running real-time instant messaging (e.g., IRC) software on a computer (abstract, lines 1-3)

receiving a first message, defining at least a part of said chat transcript, from a user (column 4, lines 60-67);

analysing text of said first message by passing the first message to a co-ordinator component and to a category object (column 5, lines 1-6);

analysing a response from the co-ordinator Component and the category object (column 10, lines 65-67) (e.g., indicating a degree of importance of "1" by displaying a the keyword "Okada" in gothic is analyzed by a user, which ultimate gives the keyword its importance)

assigning (Examiner reads as --identifying--) a verb (e.g., patent, meeting) to the text of said first message (column 12, lines 27-34);

and associating the verb with the user from which the first message is received (column 4, lines 53-59);

responsive to analysis of the text, modifying said text to create a second message in order to add context thereto (column 7, lines 32-41);

storing a history of the chat transcript (figs. 5A-D);

and transmitting said second message to interested parties (figure 7, top ).

Okada fails to specifically show: receiving a specified user mood; assigning a verb to the text of said first message based upon the specified user mood;

modifying said text of said first message by adding an assigned verb and a user associated with said assigned verb to said text of said first message to create a second message in order to add context thereto by randomly selecting a sentence structure, capitalizing the first letter of the sentence, and adding object quotes and punctuation to the second message;

giving the option to overwrite the second message; and

wherein the second message is different than the first message as defined by an alteration to the first message selected from the group consisting of an addition of text to the first message, a deletion of text from the first message, and a replacement of text in the first message.

In the same field of invention, Mandato teaches: a method of identifying a characteristic of a subscriber's device. Mandato further teaches: giving the option to overwrite the second message (e.g., depending on whether target terminal can only process a limited number of message formats, the message text can be shortened or made longer); wherein the second message is different than the first message as defined by an alteration to the first message selected from the group consisting of an addition of text to the first message, a deletion of text from the first message, and a replacement of text in the first message (e.g., weather information may be

added/deleted/replaced with new headlines)(page 2, paragraph [0042]; page 3, paragraphs [0044] and [0046]).

In the same field of invention, Hayes-Roth teaches: a interactive messenger sending an agent to a recipient. Hayes-Roth also teaches: receiving a specified user mood (e.g., the mood of the agent is influenced by the recipient) (page 2, paragraph [0010], lines 6-9); assigning a verb to the text of said first message based upon the specified user mood (e.g., delivery of dialogue is influenced by mood) (page 2, paragraph [0010], lines 1-9);

modifying said text of said first message by adding an assigned verb (e.g., delivery of dialogue is influenced by mood) (page 2, paragraph [0010], lines 1-9) and a user associated with said assigned verb to said text of said first message (fig. 4, line 4, "Barabara says:") to create a second message in order to add context thereto by randomly selecting a sentence structure (page 3, paragraph [0026], lines 1-6) (e.g., there is a large class of interactive messenger roles providing a variety of patterns of interactions), capitalizing the first letter of the sentence, and adding object quotes and punctuation to the second message (fig. 4, line 1);

a customizable messenger role created for a messenger, the role containing a sequence of interactive steps that the messenger will work through while interacting with a messenger recipient, the steps containing variables, such as sender-name, recipient-name, sender-message, and sender-question, these variables being replaced by customized values specified by a sender, for use in interaction with a designated

Art Unit: 2175

recipient, for example, the variables might be replaced with alternative values, such as: sender-name= "Mom," recipient-name="Aaron," sender-question= "Did you get something for your girlfriend?", messenger-mood=happy (page 3, paragraph [0025], lines 1-10)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Okada, Mandato, and Hayes-Roth at the time that the invention was made, to have combined the giving the option to overwrite the second message; wherein the second message is different than the first message as defined by an alteration to the first message selected from the group consisting of an addition of text to the first message, a deletion of text from the first message, and a replacement of text in the first message of Mandato and the receiving a specified user mood; assigning a verb to the text of said first message based upon the specified user mood; modifying said text of said first message by adding an assigned verb and a user associated with said assigned verb to said text of said first message to create a second message in order to add context thereto by randomly selecting a sentence structure, capitalizing the first letter of the sentence, and adding object quotes and punctuation to the second message; a customizable messenger role created for a messenger, the role containing a sequence of interactive steps that the messenger will work through while interacting with a messenger recipient, the steps containing variables, such as sender-name, recipient-name, sender-message, and sender-question, these variables being replaced by customized values specified by a sender, for use in interaction with a designated

Art Unit: 2175

recipient, for example, the variables might be replaced with alternative values, such as: sender-name= "Mom," recipient-name="Aaron," sender-question= "Did you get something for your girlfriend?", messenger-mood=happy of Hayes-Roth with the method as taught by Okada.

One would have been motivated to make such combination because a way to improve user mobility and context awareness would have been obtained and desired, as expressly taught by Mandato (page 1, paragraph [0005], lines 10-14).

As to claims 17, Hayes-Roth shows:

wherein the means for assigning a verb (e.g., "says") to the text of said first message (e.g., "sender-message" (figure 2, line 3) , comprises:

means for looking for matches (e.g., filling in standard electronic form with pre-define slots) (page 3, paragraph [0028], lines 1-5) between at least a portion of the text and at least one list, each item in a list being associated with at least one verb (e.g., asking, telling, answering) (page 3, paragraph [0026], lines 5-15); and

means for selecting (e.g., instructing messenger to deliver a message) a verb associated with a matched item (page 3, paragraph [0025], last 5 lines).

As to claims 18, Hayes-Roth shows:

wherein a plurality of verbs (e.g., says, says to tell you) are associated with at least one item in at least one list (fig. 5, lines 4-13).



As to claims 19, Okada shows:

wherein associated verbs are assigned weightings which determine how often said verbs are assigned by said assigning means (column 12, lines 51-60)

As to claims 20, Hayes-Roth:

wherein the means for assigning a verb to the text of said first message comprises: means for replacing at least a portion of the text of said first message with said verb (fig. 5, lines 4-13).

As to claims 21, Okada shows:

wherein said means for modifying the text in order to add context thereto comprises: means for defining how the text should be displayed at a client according to at least one predefined rule (column 7, lines 32-41).

As to claim 22, Okada shows:

comprising: means for instructing said client how to display said text, based upon at least one predefined rule (column 7, lines 32-41).

As to 23, Hayes-Roth shows:

means for a user to indicate their mood (e.g., mood=happy) (figure 4, line 8-12);  
and

means for using said indicated mood to influence (e.g., talk-neutral, talk-happy) the context added to said text of said first message (figure 5. lines 2-16).

As to claims 27, Okada shows:

comprising: means for informing a user to whom the text belongs of the suggested context (column 7, lines 18-25);

means for receiving acceptance or rejection of said suggested context (column 7, lines 11-15);

and means for acting upon said rejection or acceptance (column 7, lines 15-25).

Claims 24, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada in view of Mandato in view of Hayes-Roth, further in view of Kurlander (US6069622)

As to claims 24, 28:

Okada, Mandato, and Hayes-Roth show an apparatus and method substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Okada further shows: an IRC window is displayed may be modified to indicate the occurrence of the keyword (e.g., assigning context based on a predetermined theme) (column 7, lines 26-28).

Hayes-Roth further shows means for a user to indicate their mood (e.g., mood=happy) (figure 4, line 8-12); using said indicated mood to influence (e.g., talk-neutral, talk-happy) the context added to said text (figure 5, lines 2-16); including an adverb (e.g., right away, great, by the way) as part of said context, said adverb chosen according to the mood indicated by the user (figure 5, lines 14-20)

Okada, Mandato, and Hayes-Roth fail to specifically show means for including an adverb as part of said context, said adverb chosen according to the mood indicated by the user, and comprising means for assigning context based on a predetermined theme.

In the same field of invention, Kurlander teaches: comic panel generation based on input of text. Kurlander further teaches: comprising means for a user to indicate their mood (column 9, lines 47-52), means for using said indicated mood to influence the context added to said text (column 9, lines 54-56), means for including an adverb as part of said context, said adverb chosen according to the mood indicated by the user (column 10, lines 26-32), and a male character stating that he is from Ohio, the word "Ohio" being a predefined trigger word, and a system modifying the background to show a map of Ohio (e.g., assigning context based on a predetermined theme) (column 8, lines 47-51).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Okada, Mandato, Hayes-Roth and Kurlander at the time that the invention was made, to have combined the comprising means for a user to indicate their mood, means for using said indicated mood to influence the context added to said text, and means for including an adverb as part of said context, said adverb chosen according to

the mood indicated by the user of Kurlander with the apparatus and method as taught by Okada, Mandato, and Hayes-Roth.

One would have been motivated to make such combination because a way to aid a user gain a complete picture of a chat session would have been obtained and desired, as expressly taught by Kurlander (column 2, lines 14-16).

Claims 25, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada in view of Mandato in view of Hayes-Roth, further in view of Miyashita (US20030154250).

As to claims 25, 26:

Okada, Mandato and Hayes-Roth show an apparatus and method substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Okada and Mandato and Hayes-Roth fail to specifically show: comprising means for storing a history of the chat transcript and comprising means for updating said stored chat transcript; means for reflecting any changes in said transcript on the display screens of users involved in the chat.

In the same field of invention, Miyashita teaches: a client computer displaying chat log data. Miyashita further teaches: comprising means for storing a history of the chat transcript (page 4, paragraph [0060]) and comprising means for updating said stored chat transcript (page 4, paragraph [0070]); means for reflecting any changes in

said transcript on the display screens of users involved in the chat (page 4, paragraph [0072]).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Okada, Mandato, Hayes-Roth and Miyashita at the time that the invention was made, to have combined the comprising means for storing a history of the chat transcript and comprising means for updating said stored chat transcript; means for reflecting any changes in said transcript on the display screens of users involved in the chat of Miyashita with the apparatus and method as taught by Okada, Mandato, Hayes-Roth.

One would have been motivated to make such combination because a way to enable a plurality of users to communicate with one another more smoothly would have been obtained and desired, as expressly taught by Miyashita (page 1, paragraph [0006]).

References to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way. The entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Examiner reiterates that references to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way. The entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention. Applicant argues that:

1) Determining whether speech is from a certain client PC is not the same as analysing text (page 8, penultimate paragraph).

Examiner disagrees.

As one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize, determining whether speech is from a certain client PC is indeed the same as analysing text, when said speech is in a text format of an IRC client as taught by Okada (e.g., see abstract).

2) Assigning a verb to text of a first message is not the same as lowering or restoring the degree of importance of a keyword, as recited by Okada. Mandato or Hayes-Roth fail to disclose either the step of analysing text of a first message or the step of assigning a verb to text of a first message.

Examiner disagrees.

Hayes-Roth teaches modifying said text of said first message by adding an assigned verb (e.g., delivery of dialogue is influenced by mood) (page 2, paragraph [0010], lines 1-9) and a user associated with said assigned verb to said text of said first message (fig. 4, line 4, "Barabara says:") to create a second message in order to add context thereto by randomly selecting a sentence structure (page 3, paragraph [0026], lines 1-6) (e.g., there is a large class of interactive messenger roles providing a variety of patterns of interactions). Thus, it is clear Hayes-Roth discloses both the step of analysing text of a first message (e.g., to properly provide an interaction) and the step of assigning a verb to text of a first message (e.g., Barbara says).

**Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Rafal et al. [US20020002586]

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordany Núñez whose telephone number is (571)272-2753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Thursday 9am-7:30pm.

Art Unit: 2175

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JN  
8/11/2008

/William L. Bashore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175